25

(Cases called)

2.3

THE COURT: I was notified yesterday that Bankruptcy Court issued a stay of the proceedings in these four cases until May 29.

What I'm going to propose, unless I get a different proposal, is that I just cancel all the other appearances and maybe tentatively schedule appearance for May 31 or some other later date, depending on when you are appearing back before the Bankruptcy Court.

I know the Bankruptcy Court has indicated the parties should engage in settlement discussions, but obviously unless someone has a different view, there's nothing to do before the 29th of May. If the Court extends that stay beyond the 29th of May or extends it indefinitely, I may put it on the suspense docket, if it is still a possibility that we're going to go forward after the bankruptcy proceedings or the bankruptcy stay.

Why don't I hear from anyone who has a different suggestion or has any information that they want to add to the record at this point.

Anyone for the plaintiff.

MR. TURNER: Your Honor, I'll just note the order erroneously states there was no objection to the stay order. Hudson Bay did object.

This is frustrating for us, because as your Honor is

1 aware, we were told long ago there was money available when 2 Patriot stood before this court and said they were solvent. 3 Then we were told there was money available for mediation. 4 Last September we attempted mediation and it was not 5 productive. 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Here we are again. The Bankruptcy Court has ordered us into mediation. Obviously we're going to comply with that order, but we would like oral argument to be put on the calendar for as early as possible after this day has expired.

THE COURT: Do you know what are the appearances to the schedule before the Bankruptcy Court at this time?

MR. TURNER: I don't know of any appearance scheduled. The mediation itself has not been scheduled yet, your Honor.

THE COURT: The bankruptcy proceeding judge did not schedule a next appearance?

MR. TURNER: Plaintiffs here are required to attend, your Honor. I'm sure the other proceedings they attended.

MR. LEVI: We don't have an alternative suggestion. We're very much in favor of an oral argument immediately upon the cessation of the mediation, 90-day period.

We did mediate previously and it didn't work. Obviously we'll have an open mind, but if it doesn't work we think this case should go ahead full speed.

I just want to note for your Honor that in January the defendant Mariano commenced a state court action against the

Cast 7:16 Cv-02767-GBD-SDA Document 294 Filed 03/09/18 Page 5 of 14

hedge funds, an additional third hedge fund, an employee of 1 2 JPMorgan Securities, and an employee of an affiliate, 3 essentially alleging the very same claims that are alleged in 4 this court in the counterclaims, just naming a defendant. very defendant in the counterclaims in this case who was 5 6 alleged to have made -- the JPMorgan employee -- false statements X and Y. They started a lawsuit against in him in 7 8 Florida alleging he made false statements X and Y.

There's a bit of a competing action that Mr. Mariano saw fit to start.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

THE COURT: Is that action on the list of cases that the Bankruptcy Court stayed?

MR. LEVI: It is not. Patriot National did not seek to stay those cases as part of what was on a schedule of state cases. It is not stayed.

I have spoken with my adversary in this case,
Mr. Mariano's counsel, Mr. Scherer, who is also plaintiff's
counsel in Mr. Mariano's Florida state court action, and
suggested to him that the time to respond on the part of one
defendant who's been served be extended for the same period
that the mediation is going to take place, on theory that this
is all one big global dispute.

He hasn't been able yet to get a response from his client about that. I'm hopeful they'll say yes and that we don't have an competing action or an end run around this action

Case 1:16 Cv-02767-GBD-SDA Document 294 Filed 03/09/18 Page 6 of 14

at the same time this action is stayed.

All of that is a long way of saying, as soon as this mediation period comes to an end, assuming it's not successful, we do want the argument to go before your Honor, which is what your Honor has tentatively said he's going to schedule. We're in agreement with that

THE COURT: What's the defense position?

MS. COLEMAN: Good morning, your Honor. We'd like to point out that in addition to the stay that Judge Gross just issued yesterday, the 90-day temporary stay of the action, there are two other stays that are important here and the remain in effect. We will be back here if the mediation is not successful, arguing that as well.

No. 1, the case audit is obviously stated as against Patriot National Inc. itself, because Patriot National is a debtor in Chapter 11, 362 of the bankruptcy code stays the action entirely as to Patriot.

In addition to that, your Honor, Patriot's position is that 362(a)(3) of the bankruptcy code also operates as a stay of this action in its entirety because the defendants in this action other than Patriot, as to whom it would not be stayed under (a)(1) are getting advance defense cost from Patriot's D&O policies. Patriot has a property interest in its D&O policy making the property of the estate subject to the stay of 362(a)(3).

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

That's not an issue before the Court today, because your Honor has recognized Judge Gross' stay of the entire proceeding, but we want to reserve our rights and we will be back here arguing that there's no ability to go forward, certainly against Patriot. I don't think anybody's suggesting that. Also with respect to the other defendants, our position 7 is that you can't go forward as to those either, because that would violate the automatic stay.

We will be making that argument then, your Honor.

That argument should be first made to the THE COURT: Bankruptcy Court. The Bankruptcy Court is going to sustain the stay. The Bankruptcy Court made a determination that the stay should be extended to the 29th. If the Bankruptcy Court missed that stay or intends to lift that stay, then you should first try to convince the Bankruptcy Court that those parties are essential to resolution of the bankruptcy before I hear an application with regard to whether or not it is automatically extended.

In the abstract, my position is usually that it's not automatically extended unless the Bankruptcy Court feels it's appropriate. It's the bankruptee who is entitled to the automatic stay. If you can convince me otherwise, that's fine.

I'll put it this way, you're even less likely to convince me of that if you haven't made the application to the Bankruptcy Court to make a determination that it is essential

for the bankruptcy proceeding that the proceedings against the
others be stayed. If you can't convince the Bankruptcy Court
of that, then you're going to have to tell me why you think
that even though the Bankruptcy Court is determined that it's
not essential to have those parties in the case and have the
proceeding stayed against them and why it makes sense for me to

independently order that it's automatically stayed.

MS. COLEMAN: Understood, your Honor. As I said, I don't want to take the Court and the parties' time with respect to that today.

We will proceed as you've suggested. We will ask Judge Gross to make a finding, which he's already found yesterday on the record that the D&O policies property of the debtors' estate, which is what brings them into the purview of Section 362(a)(3), and would operate as a bar to proceeding in this matter, because this matter involves those proceeds. But we will ask Judge Gross to make that determination if that would be helpful for your Honor.

THE COURT: Was it Judge Gross' intent to stay these proceedings in anticipation of staying all proceedings until the resolution of the bankruptcy, or just simply stay this to give the parties an opportunity to settle with the intent of lifting that stay if the parties are not able to settle by May 29?

MS. COLEMAN: It was the latter, your Honor. We made a

2.3

motion to Judge Gross and asked him if he would stay these eight separate litigations in different courts for 90 days, subject to extension, if things were going well.

I have to say I'm not particularly optimistic, given the statements by other parties who are already planning to let the mediation period expire then come right back. Maybe I'll be proved wrong. I hope so, but he was intending not to stay until the end of the case, but again, this isn't imposing a separate stay from 362. This is imposing a new stay just for the 90 days to see if the parties can mediate to settle.

THE COURT: Is there a transcript of that?

MS. COLEMAN: We've asked for a transcript, your Honor. In Bankruptcy Court it's audio, so it takes a couple of extra days. We will supply that as soon as it's available.

THE COURT: My intention at this point would be to set it down for May 31. If the stay expires, then we're in a position to move forward. If the stay doesn't expire or the stay is not extended by some determination by the Bankruptcy Court or by me, then we're going to move forward on the 31st. We'll move forward with the motions that are already outstanding.

I'm going to set it down for May 31 at 10:30. Just let me know before that time what the current status is.

There is no appearance scheduled before the Bankruptcy Court, Ms. Coleman?

MS. COLEMAN: Not on this matter, your Honor. I think what Judge Gross contemplates is that the parties will very quickly set up the mediation sessions and start going through that process. If the mediation is successful, then the debtors will make a Rule 9019 motion in the Bankruptcy Court for Judge Gross's approval of the settlement of these actions.

THE COURT: If it's not successful?

MS. COLEMAN: If it's not successful, we haven't made the determination yet, but the debtor's independent director Mr. Landers is in charge of what we do with these cases and my guess is that he will recommend that we try to get Judge Gross to extend the stay to continue to try to settle the cases.

If not, then he'll instruct me whether I should go to each of those eight courts and make the argument that I just articulated to your Honor, that section 362(a)(3) bars further proceedings against the property of the estate in the form of the D&O proceeds, and bars the continuation of these litigations in any event.

It's a lot easier, too, which is why we did this way, to ask Judge Gross for a stay in omnibus, stay of everything, for 90 days. If we have to, we'll go to each of the judges presiding over the other cases and make our arguments with respect to 362(a)(3).

THE COURT: Obviously my view is that I would like to have Judge Gross' position with regard to whether or not he

thinks a further stay is appropriate to resolve the bankruptcy.

If he says it is, then we can go ahead and extend it. We don't have to worry about that. If he says it's not, I'd like to know why he says it's not and you say it is.

I think my view is always in the first instance. It's the Bankruptcy Court that should determine which parties are essential in the bankruptcy, and as I said, unless you can convince me otherwise that legally there's an automatic stay, but I don't know enough about the relationships to make that determination on the record.

MS. COLEMAN: Certainly, your Honor. I'm not asking you to do that. I will do my best to convince your Honor if it becomes necessary.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. TURNER: Just one other thing, your Honor, as long as we're putting all our cards on the table. If the stay does expire, not only would we want to proceed against the non-debtor on summary judgment, Mr. Mariano, but there are pending counterclaims that both defendants have against us, the breach of contract counterclaims that remain in the case.

We would plan immediately upon the stay to move for summary judgment as well on those counterclaims against both defendants. We take the position that Patriot's counterclaims are not subject to the bankruptcy stay since they brought those claims and they're not claims against the estate.

1 2 N 3 H 4 C 5 C 7 r

MR. GOLDBERGER: Your Honor, just to add to what

Mr. Turner said, we join in that, and we point out to your

Honor that your Honor already had to reach that conclusion in

connection with the motion to dismiss argument that you ruled

on recently and you, in fact, dismissed a number of

counterclaims that Patriot had. We think the summary judgment

motion on those counterclaims would be appropriate when the

stay expires.

THE COURT: Why don't you let me know by May 1 or 2 what you say the status is so we'll know whether we're going to go forward on May 31, if we're going to move forward, how we're going to move forward, because what I hear now is there are outstanding motions, further motions that may be anticipated by the defense, unless there are further motions, summary judgment motions that may be anticipated by the plaintiff.

Let me know the layout by May 1. If you haven't been able to resolve this case by May 1, let me know how you all intend to proceed in this proceeding and how you intend to proceed in the bankruptcy proceeding.

Yes.

MR. BONDI: Your Honor, I appreciate you suggesting, we would like to know, and I don't have any objection to that.

My only suggestion, your Honor, might be that we push that date out a little bit further.

May 1 is going to roll around pretty quickly and we've

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We'll otherwise schedule for May 31 at 10:30. I'll anticipate seeing the parties at that time, unless I get communication from you no later than May 18 that we should meet, either at a later or earlier time.

MR. BONDI: Thank you, your Honor. We agree with that